

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending in the application. The position set forth in the Office Action has been carefully considered. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's courtesy in providing a personal interview with Applicant's representative on December 2, 2005. During the interview, the Applicant's representative pointed out perceived differences between the invention and the Mitchell patent. As the interview summary states, the Examiner agreed with Applicant's remarks, and would withdraw the rejection based on a combination of Kadowaki and Mitchell upon filing the response.

I. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the allowance of claims 1-20, and 29.

For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant believes that the other pending claims are also in condition for allowance.

II. REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 21-28 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 21-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on a combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,313,921 (Kadowaki) and U.S. Patent No. 6,839,468 (Mitchell). These claims are believed to be allowable for at least the following reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Independent claims 21, 24, 25, and 28 require, *inter alia*, "a controller operable to ... , send decoding data suitable for use by the printer to decode the rendered data, and send the rendered data to the printer."

According to one exemplary embodiment of the invention, the processor 122 in the server 120 renders (or rasterizes) an image for the requested document of value by utilizing the printer driver 124, encodes the rendered image data by using the encoding table stored in the database 128, and sends the encoded rendered image data 544 to the printer 110 via the network 140. The printer 110 receives the encoded rendered image data 544 from the content server 120. The printer 110 also receives the decoding/encoding table 418 from the content server 120. The controller 111 of the printer 110 decodes the encoded rendered image data 544 by using decoding data included in the decoding/encoding table 418. See, e.g., page 9, lines 1-15; page 17, lines 11-18; and page 18, lines 8-13 of the present specification.

As the Office Action admits, the Kadowaki patent fails to teach a server suitable for use in conjunction with a printer operable to print rendered data representing an image, comprising: a controller operable to send decoding data suitable for use by the printer to decode the rendered data, and send the rendered data to the printer. The Action cited the Mitchell patent as describing the above-identified claimed features which were not taught by Kadowaki. Specifically the Action cites column 7, lines 23-48 of Mitchell. However, the cited portion of Mitchell fails to teach or suggest the above-identified claimed features.

First, the cited portion of Mitchell fails to teach or suggest "send[ing] decoding data suitable for use by the printer to decode the rendered data" as claimed. In FIG. 4 of Mitchell, the printer server 406 sends compressed data which is then reconstructed by the JPEG decoder 407. Such compressed data is not for decoding some other data. By contrast, the claimed decoding data is used for decoding the rendered data which is different from the decoding data itself. It is noted that the JPEG decoder 407 shown in Mitchell does not require any decoding key or data. The decoder 407 simply receives an incoming compressed data flow with no decoding data. Therefore, Mitchell cannot be said to teach or suggest the claimed sending of "decoding data."

Second, the cited portion of Mitchell fails to teach or suggest "send[ing] the rendered data to the printer." As illustrated in FIG. 4, Mitchell's printer server 406 sends "compressed data" which must be processed by the JPEG decoder 407 to generate "reconstructed image." As appreciated by those skilled in the art, such compressed data cannot be interpreted as rendered data as claimed because Mitchell's compressed data output by the server 406 have not been "rendered" yet by the JPEG decoder 407. In other words, Mitchell's printer server 406 merely sends "unrendered" data. Therefore, Mitchell cannot be said to teach or suggest the claimed sending of "rendered data."


In addition, in order for Mitchell to teach the claimed features, the JPEG decoder 407 must receive at least two separate data streams, i.e., the claimed decoding data, and the claimed rendered data. However, as shown in FIG. 4, Mitchell's JPEG decoder 407 only receives a single stream of compressed data. Therefore, Mitchell fails to cure the deficiencies of Kadowaki in this regard as well.

In view of the foregoing, a combination of Kadowaki and Mitchell cannot be said to render the present invention obvious. Therefore, the invention of independent claims 21, 24, 25, and 28, and their dependent claims are believed to be patentable over the cited art. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

III. CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance at an early date. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Haruo Yawata
Limited Recognition No. L0109

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
510-663-1100, ext. 245